



Official Minutes of the
City of Cottonwood Development Review Board Meeting
Held September 18, 2008 at 2:00 PM at the
Community Development Conference Room
821 N. Main Street Cottonwood, Arizona

Call to Order

Vice Chairperson Anderson called the meeting to order at 2:06 PM.

Roll Call

Chairperson Backus	Absent	Member Knowles	Absent
Vice Chairperson Anderson	Present	Member Wasden	Present
Member Bartmus	Present	Member Lovett*	Present
Member Cox	Absent	*(P&Z Commiss. Rep)	

Staff Present:

George Gehlert, Community Development Director
Wes Ballew, Staff Planner
Carol Hulse, Planning Technician

Public Present:

Kevin Burson	Tom Hurkett	Jim McInnis
Gary Muise	Britt Olachea	Eric Seitz
Glen Smar	Cuptis Supe	Ben Wittbank
Mike Vick		

Consideration of Minutes of 6/26/08

Motion: To approve the 6/23/08 minutes as written.

Moved by Diane Lovett, seconded by Judd Wasden.

Vote: Motion carried 4-0.

Consideration of Minutes of 7/24/08

Action postponed due to lack of a quorum of attendees from the 7/24/08 meeting.

DRB 08-002

Slag Pile

APN: 406-42-097M

Review plans for a process facility on a portion of 12.25 acres zoned CF and located on the Verde Valley Fair Association property north of Hwy. 89A between 6th and 12th Streets. Owner: Minerals Research & Recovery, Inc. Agent: Tom Hurkett

Planner Ballew summarized the proposal and showed graphics depicting the location, surrounding zoning, site, plans, and view from the neighborhood towards the slag pile.

Discussion between Mr. Ballew and Mr. Hurkett highlighted the following points.

- Proposal consists of a series of silos, a catwalk, and a conveyor facility.
- The silos would be built in the beginning but not operated until near the end of the process.
- Industrial zoning surrounds the project except for the neighborhood to the east. Staff is concerned about appropriate screening between the site and the neighborhood.

- Silos would be 50 feet high. The elevator is the highest point and it would be 80 feet high.

A discussion about landscaping/screening revealed the following.

- The applicant met with the neighbors along the fence line. They requested a berm of shrubs to form a wall to screen vehicular traffic and headlights. There would be a cluster of trees in the line of sight further away from the homes as requested by the neighbors so they can retain their view of the mountains.
- The shrubs would be 25-gallon and the proposed trees are fast growing 24-inch box trees.

Director Gehlert provided a brief history of the project and the neighbors' appeal of the conditional use permit. The Council denied the appeal. Concerns included sensitivity to the visibility from the residential area (mostly located to the northeast of the site) and the V.F.W. to the north. Using a projected aerial photo, Mr. Gehlert further explained the site, its relationship to the fairgrounds and to residential neighborhoods, and illustrated what the residential neighborhoods would see of the processing facility. He talked about the dust problem on the fairgrounds when the wind blows.

Discussion about surfacing with slag revealed that the access and working areas would be surfaced by the applicant. However, that would not cure the existing dust issue.

Vice Chairperson Anderson asked for a brief history and explanation of why they do what they do and Mr. Hurkett complied.

Director Gehlert said the primary concerns are landscaping and buffering. He said their plans are to hollow out the back portion of the slag pile and install the crusher there to reduce noise.

Responding to Director Gehlert's inquiry, Mr. Hurkett reported that the neighbors were positive, pleased that Mr. Hurkett talked to them, and they wanted the slag to go away.

Answering Board members' questions, Mr. Hurkett said:

- Fourth of July fireworks - there would be no danger if they continue to shoot fireworks from the slag pile because all of the equipment is mechanical/steel equipment.
- Operation would stop at 10:00 p.m. per Planning & Zoning Commission stipulation.
- Their building would be similar in size to the V.F.W. building.
- Elevator is tall but only 2 feet by 3 feet providing a small profile.

Vice Chairperson Anderson opened the floor to Board discussion, summarized as follows.

- Structure colors – the Board preferred a light green similar to the water tanks with the same color on all buildings. However, the Board recognized that the pre-fabricated building would come in a tan finish that would be similar to the nearby V.F.W. building.
- The Board viewed the proposed silo siding, which was corrugated steel that Mr. Hurkett said they could paint.

Mr. Hurkett said:

- Lighting meets minimum OSHA standards and would all be fully shielded.
- Lights on platforms would not be on 24 hours a day.
- All three platforms are below the level of the slag.

- The slag pile would shield the lights on three sides and the silos would shield them on the fourth side.
- Engineers were instructed to design the primary shielding from the east side so the light illuminates towards the west.
- Applicant will design lighting so no bulbs are visible from the east.

Director Gehlert expressed concern about dust control and asked the applicants about surfacing the dusty areas. There was miscellaneous discussion pointing out that the proposed landscaping would be a good windbreak but the existing dust problem is the Fairgrounds' responsibility.

Responding to questions from Vice Chairperson Anderson and Director Gehlert, Mr. Hurkett said landscaping would be watered with wastewater or water from a tank and not tied into the city water system. Therefore, there would be no backflow device. Most potable water use would be in the office. There would be a dumpster near the maintenance building by the gate. Coolers would be mounted at ground level.

The discussion turned to the truck route. As it stood at the time of the meeting, trucks would go out to Aspen Street, then over to Sixth Street per the Planning and Zoning Commission stipulation. However, in response to neighborhood concerns, the applicants negotiated an easement for a more direct route to Sixth Street. They will ask the Planning and Zoning Commission for an amendment to the conditional use permit to allow that access.

Director Gehlert noted that this is an industrial plant and a unique review for DRB. He encouraged the Board to ask questions.

Mr. Hurkett reported that bags of product would be stored in the bagging building. He is talking to Taylor Waste (to the west) about leasing some land there for additional storage.

Motion: To approve DRB 08-002 with the following six stipulations.

- 1. That development conforms to the site plan dated 8/14/08.***
- 2. That the landscaping includes the berm with shrubs and trees to provide shielding for the neighborhood and other landscaping in conformance to the landscape plan dated 9/15/08.***
- 3. That all structures are painted "Colony Green" (or similar) per sample shown (except that the prefabricated building will be painted by the manufacturer in a standard tan).***
- 4. That lighting, particularly on the silo units, is completely shielded from adjacent properties.***
- 5. That the pack light fixtures are fully shielded and aimed straight down.***
- 6. That the dumpster is fully enclosed.***

Moved by Judd Wasden, seconded by Pat Bartmus.

Vote: Motion carried 4-0.

Member Lovett and other Board members commended the project.

Director Gehlert advised the applicant about the next steps regarding submittal of a reclamation agreement for Council's consideration and seeking an amendment to the conditional use permit regarding the access revision before submittal of construction plans.

DRB 08-046 Eagle Cliff at the Cove APN 406-55-053 & 054
Review plans for a 6,700 square foot 3-office building on .84 acres zoned C-2 located at 855 & 891 Cove Parkway. Owners: McInnis Family Trust. Agent: Eric Seitz.

Planner Ballew summarized the proposal explaining the location and zoning and projecting the site plan and elevations. Some points of his presentation were:

- Applicant intends to preserve as many of the mature trees as possible.
- Applicant may convert to three office condominium units.
- Buildings are similar to each other and are a southwestern style.
- Staff did not have many comments.
- Staff wants to see a comprehensive sign plan.
- Staff emphasized preservation of the trees.

Eric Seitz, the designer and applicant's representative, made the following points.

- Will leave the "cool" big trees – just clean up the area and leave natural.
- All buildings will have outside sitting areas.
- 100% of the landscaping will be on 2/3 of the lot between the buildings and the street because of the natural landscaping at the back.
- The rendering is the view from the driveway.
- There would be a condominium association. The two large buildings could be split in half so there is the potential for five owners.
- Association would be responsible for all outside maintenance and the fire sprinklers.
- He showed an artist's rendering of a monument sign.
- All unit signs would be the same design but they do not know the number of tenants so they cannot show exact size and placement at this time.
- They will use stone in areas as shown on the elevations
- Dumpster is placed so the street side would show a stucco wall. Only the tenants would see the gate.

Mr. Seitz provided the following answers to Board members' questions.

- They do not know who the tenants will be.
- There would be a 2-hour fire separation between owners.
- Vegetation would be a mixture that would keep the feeling of cottonwoods and mulberries around the buildings.
- The same rock and 2-color stucco would be used on all the buildings.

Board members were very complimentary about the proposal.

There was extensive discussion about the sign. All Board members expressed dislike for the sign saying it would take away from the building. After hearing Board members' comments, Mr. Seitz agreed to come up with something more in keeping with the building that would still adequately identify the applicants' property.

Other items discussed were:

- Dumpster placement and access.
- The applicant would probably pave “driveway to driveway” (connect with the neighboring parcel) to create fewer openings onto Cove Parkway.
- Options for backflow placement.

Director Gehlert noted that the parking lot is in front and Cove Parkway is becoming lined with parking lots. He said, however, that is a separate issue.

Motion to approve DRB 08-046 with five stipulations.

- 1. That development conforms to the site plan dated 7/28/08 and revisions through 8/21/08.***
- 2. That development conforms to the landscape plan dated 7/28/08 and revisions through 8/20/08.***
- 3. That the big trees are preserved to the greatest extent possible.***
- 4. That the backflow device is screened appropriately.***
- 5. That the monument sign design fits with the building design and color and that a new sign plan with revisions to the freestanding sign is submitted.***

Motioned by Judd Wasden, seconded by Diane Lovett.

Vote: Motion carried 4-0.

DRB 08-044 APS Cottonwood Service Center APN 407-09-150Y

Review plans for a 2,400 sq. ft. warehouse and service facility on 10 acres zoned I-2 and located at Coury & Genesis Drives. Owner/Agent: Kevin Burson.

Note: several people represented the project but they were not identified as they spoke. Therefore, they are referred to as “the applicant.”

Planner Ballew presented the proposal. He projected the landscape plan and noted that it does not fully demonstrate that the proposed coverage meets the ordinance. Mr. Ballew also projected the grading/drainage plan and the topography map. He pointed out that the project sits on a hill and questioned if the six-foot screen wall would adequately screen the storage yard. He also noted that the lighting would be uphill from the highway and could shine down onto the highway.

Mr. Ballew said staff wants a sidewalk along the street.

Referencing the topo map, Director Gehlert noted there is a considerable grade change from the front to the back of the property. The applicant said it is approximately 15-20 feet grade change in a distance of about 1,000 feet. There was discussion about cut and fill, retaining walls, the use of the building, etc. The applicants provided the following information.

- Most retaining wall height would be three feet maximum – a small area would be up to seven feet.
- There would be a three-foot cut on one side and a three-foot fill on the side by the wash.
- Customer service would remain at its current location on 12th Street.
- There would be approximately 60 employees at this new location.
- Employees park on one side and APS vehicles park on the other side in a secure area.

- They left room for some growth.
- They need a warehouse and a small office.
- The project would be fenced with a six-foot high masonry wall.
- APS required this to be a LEED Silver building but they are shooting for Gold.
- The wash bay for vehicles would re-circulate water.
- They plan to install an oversized tank so they can irrigate with the wastewater and they will tie the gutter drainage into it.
- Parking lot lighting would be fully shielded.
- Mirrored glass windows are Low E class with just a bit of reflectance. If it proves to be blinding, the applicants would change it. The windows are dual pane insulated.
- Mechanical units for the office would be in the warehouse on a mezzanine. If anything were on the roof, it would be behind the parapet.
- Façade would be split-faced block and the banding would be smooth block.
- Backflow device for domestic water would be out by the street and properly screened, perhaps by the monument sign.
- Signage would be minimal but was not designed yet. There would be one sign on the building and a low-profile monument sign.
- They would not use solar on the roof due to concerns that the benefits do not outweigh the maintenance problems such as a leaky roof.
- Sidewalk along the street face in front of the building is required by code (Ordinance 144 – offsite improvements).
- Perimeter wall – would be CMU or keystone. It would be approximately ¼ mile long and would jog or have columns for architectural interest. There would be no razor wire.

Board members were complimentary about the building; particularly that it would be LEED certified and the water catchment component.

Director Gehlert re-emphasized to the Board that part of their response concerns the grading.

Motion: To approve DRB 08-044 with five stipulations.

- 1. That development conforms to the conceptual grading and improvement plans, site plans, and elevations dated 9/9/08.***
- 2. That development conforms to the landscape plans dated 9/4/08 and meets all city requirements. Demonstrate plants, counts, and conformance on the plans.***
- 3. That all exterior lights are fully shielded.***
- 4. That the backflow device is screened appropriately.***
- 5. That the six-foot wall matches the building. Applicant to submit detail, including the footprint, for administrative approval.***

Member Wasden highly encouraged the proposed rain catchment system and the LEED design.

Moved by Judd Wasden, seconded by Pat Bartmus.

Vote: Motion carried 4-0.

The applicant requested staff support to do site work quickly to allow APS to store equipment on the site before the building is constructed. The applicant emphasized that this is critical for APS and asked for expedited review of their packages along with prior approval for grubbing the site.

Director Gehlert said he could not respond to the request until the applicant submits the packages through Public Works. Answering Director Gehlert's questions, the applicant said there was an issue with water and they were connecting to Camp Verde water. There is no sewer available so they are going with septic.

The Board recommended that Public Works expedite to the extent possible.

Board Discussion

▪ General

In other business, the Board reviewed and discussed a proposed sign for "A Scoop Above Ice Cream Parlor" located on N. Main Street. The sign contained more than three background colors, which Director Gehlert said he did not have authority to approve. The Board expressed disapproval of the checkerboard background and the 3-scoops on the ice cream cone depicted in three different colors. Members commented that the sign is so "busy" you look past what it is. The sign should be simplified. Their recommendation to Director Gehlert was:

- A solid background in the lighter blue color – no checkerboard effect.
- One or two scoops of ice cream depicted on top of the cone, not three.

▪ Reports and Updates

Director Gehlert reported:

- Staff is moving forward with tweaks to the city sign code. He explained the latest proposal concerning freestanding signs.
- Staff proposed amending the parking code to allow shared parking and to reduce parking requirements for big box stores.
- Review of landscaping ordinance has been on hold.

Director Gehlert may not be here for the October 23 meeting. That meeting might be rescheduled to October 16.

Adjournment

Chairperson Anderson adjourned the meeting at 4:13 PM.

Minutes prepared by Carol Hulse, Planning Technician

Date Approved October 23, 2008